



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,912	10/22/2003	Akira Izumi	P/1250-264	6373
2352	7590	06/19/2006	EXAMINER	
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN			CHEN, KIN CHAN	
1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS			ART UNIT	
NEW YORK, NY 100368403			PAPER NUMBER	
			1765	

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/690,912

Applicant(s)

IZUMI ET AL.

Examiner

Kin-Chan Chen

Art Unit

1765

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See attached sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Kin-Chan Chen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1765

Response to the request-for-reconsideration-after-final

Applicant has argued that the prior art does not teach using ordinary temperature. It is not persuasive. As has been stated in the office action, temperature is known to be result-effective variable and commonly determined by routine experiment. The process of conducting routine experimentations so as to produce an expected result is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. In the absence of showing criticality or new, unexpected results **that differs in kind and not merely in degree from the result of the prior art**, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify the prior art by performing routine experiments (by using ordinary temperature) to obtain optimal result with a reasonable expectation of success. See the case laws cited below.

Also see *Verhaverbeke* (US 5,972,123; col. 5, lines 25-29; 43-45). *Verhaverbeke* discloses that the exposure time, temperature, and concentration may vary in wet etching or cleaning, which clearly shows that temperature is a recognized result-effective variable in the art of wet cleaning.

Changes in compositions, temperature, concentrations, or other process conditions of a process do not impart patentability unless the recited ranges are critical (i.e., **they produce a new and unexpected result that differs in kind and not merely in degree from the result of the prior art**). *In re Woodruff*, 16USPQ2d 1934,1936 (Fed. Cir.1990); *In re Hoeschele*, 406 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 809; *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). MPEP 2144.05 II.

CRITICALITY OF PROCESSING PARAMETERS


"Where the principal difference between the claimed process and that taught by the reference is a temperature difference, it is incumbent upon applicant to establish criticality of that difference" Ex parte Khusid, 174 USPQ 59.

Art Unit: 1765

Applicant has argued that applying megasonic vibration to the solution. It is not persuasive. It is notoriously well known in the art. Hall (abstract; col. 2, lines 12-25) or Bran (US 6,039,059; abstract; col. 1, lines 10-15) is relied on to show the conventional method of applying megasonic vibrations to the solution. Because it is a convention method and because it is disclosed by Hall or Bran, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to apply megasonic vibrations to the solution in the process of Aoki in order to effectively remove the particles.

In light of the comments, the rejections are maintained.

June 15, 2006


KIN-CHAN CHEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER